

that this section simply places a definite limitation on the time within which he can be sent back to Great Britain or Australia or wherever he may have come from. After he has come here he has only to prove that he has been here for five years; then he gets his certificate, and any attempt to deport him or send him out of the country after that time is met by the fact that he has established by certificate his position as a Canadian, and that therefore no one has any right to send him out of the country.

With the amendment that has been moved this afternoon I think we can all get together. I agree with the hon. member for Calgary West that there will be no measure before this house in connection with which it would be more important that we should have unanimity than this measure. For a long time in Canada we have had discussions with regard to citizenship. Those discussions have caused divisions among us. If we could put through this house in a manner satisfactory to all a bill dealing with matters that are of importance to us, it would be to the benefit of this country and would greatly improve our position in future. With so little difference between us, as to whether a man should wait until the end of the five-year period before it would be impossible for him to be sent back to the country from which he came for treatment or because of anything he had done before coming here, I should think we might agree and have this bill go through unanimously. I do not think there is enough difference to warrant pressing the amendment. I would hope that in the light of the amendment which it has been suggested the Secretary of State will move to follow the passage of this section it might be possible to withdraw the amendment of the hon. member for Eglinton.

There has been a helpful discussion of the whole issue, and if it is desired to discuss it farther it might be discussed from different points of view, but I think it would be wise in the interests of all concerned that the amendment to this section should not be voted upon. After having had a discussion and after having had the amendment which has been proposed and which really takes the substance out of any criticism there was before, I think we could accept the section unanimously and go on to the next.

Mr. HANSELL: I was pleased to hear the minister make the announcement that he was going to propose an amendment. It has not been presented to us yet and we do not know the wording.

Mr. GARDINER: I understood the amendment was read by the minister.

Mr. MARTIN: I did not read the amendment; I stated what was in it.

Mr. HANSELL: I was pleased with the minister's explanation because it overcomes any objections that I have. I am wondering if it would not be well, now that we are talking about procedure, if we let the present section stand so that we can go forward with the bill and have the minister's amendment. We could then come back to the section and perhaps there would not be any trouble in disposing of it then. I am making that suggestion.

I am quite satisfied with the minister's explanation. As the section would have stood I pictured British people coming into this country and having the embarrassment of having to go before courts the same as those who are becoming naturalized. I can think of cases where that would involve considerable embarrassment. One particular case is that of a family who came to this country many years ago and who in turn raised a family here. The mother and father went back to England just after the first great war. The father died and the mother expects to return. I can see considerable embarrassment to that lady when she returns to Canada to be with her family if she has to go before a court of law in order to be declared a Canadian citizen. According to the minister's explanation, that would not be necessary. I believe that the government should reserve the right, if upon application certain documentary evidence is not satisfactory, of conducting a further investigation, even to the point of having the party appear before a judge. I make the suggestion that it might speed up things a little if we allowed the section to stand until the minister could present his amendment.

Mr. MARTIN: Although it is not strictly in accordance with the rules, I think I had better read the amendment to the committee so that we can have it before us. We have had a lot of discussion and I do not think a postponement of the section would help greatly. I am suggesting that section 10 be amended, first, by inserting a new subsection 2 which would read as follows—

Mr. HACKETT: Does that replace the subsection 2 that is in already?

Mr. MARTIN: The present subsection 2 would become subsection 3. The new subsection I am introducing would take the place of subsection 2.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN (Mr. Golding): I think we should deal with the amendment that is before the committee. The minister's amendment is really a later amendment.